

# ITEMS

---

VOLUME 11 • NUMBER 3 • SEPTEMBER 1957  
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

## WASHINGTON STAFF OF THE COUNCIL MOVES TO NEW YORK

THE Social Science Research Council's office at 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. was discontinued on July 26, 1957, and the administration of all Council programs was consolidated at the Council's headquarters, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17. The members of the staff who have been located in Washington, Elbridge Sibley, Bryce Wood, Joseph B. Casagrande, and their assistants have been transferred to New York.

The decision to terminate the Washington office was precipitated by the federal government's expropriation last spring, for its own use, of privately owned buildings on Jackson Place, including that in which the Council had maintained offices. Consolidation of the Council's staff work at one point had been under consideration for some time, however, in the belief that increased efficiency of operation would result.

For fifteen years a substantial part of the Council's research planning, administrative, and advisory activities was centered in its Washington office, where nearly half of its staff was located. The Washington office was first established early in 1942 to deal with rapidly increasing wartime requests from government agencies for advice on the recruitment of social science personnel and the staffing and operation of new research agencies, and from many academic institutions and individual social scientists regarding the impact upon them of the rapid expansion of the wartime agencies and programs. This new personnel office took over quarters at 726 Jackson Place that had been occupied since 1935 by the Council's Committee on Social Security (1935-43) as well as by its Committee on Public Administration during part of that time. Members of the Washington staff were drawn into a wide range of formal and informal consultative relationships, into successive acceptance of many temporary administrative responsibilities, and

later into numerous aspects of the demobilization of the research organizations that had been improvised in the course of the war.

Large numbers of young social scientists had occasion to travel to Washington prior to their discharge from military service, and it seemed efficient to administer there the Council's Demobilization Award Program, under which 151 fellowships were given from 1944 to 1946 to expedite the return to social science research of persons whose careers had been interrupted by the war. Inasmuch as this program constituted the greater part of the Council's fellowship operations during those years, the responsibility for management of fellowship and grant-in-aid programs was shifted to the Washington office and remained there until this summer.

The continuing presence in Washington of several members of the Council staff necessarily led to conducting there at least part of the work of certain research planning committees as well as of those administering fellowships and grants-in-aid. Among the former were committees whose activities were closely linked to those of government agencies, such as the Committees on Government Records and Research, on the Federal Government and Research, on the Source Book of Historical Statistics, and on War Studies. It also became convenient to staff in Washington committees such as those on Labor Market Research, Housing Research, World Area Research, and International Cooperation among Social Scientists. Most staff work for several current committees has also been done in Washington, namely, the Committees on Comparative Politics, Linguistics and Psychology, Mathematical Training of Social Scientists, National Security Policy Research, and Research Training. There will be no change in these staff assignments, which will be carried on in New York.

# EXPLORATIONS IN SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY

by Alexander H. Leighton \*

IN THE years following World War II there came into existence a number of community-oriented research projects concerned with the relationship of the socio-cultural environment to mental health and mental illness. The Wellesley Study, work at New Haven, Syracuse, Phoenix, and the Stirling County Study may be cited as examples.<sup>1</sup> Those of us engaged in these researches became aware shortly of a strong need for sharing the problems of theory and method, and this was made possible in a series of meetings sponsored by the Milbank Memorial Fund. Such meetings, together with the progress of the work, increased our desire for some kind of broad, yet integrative, study. Each felt he was working in a small part of a vast field largely unknown to him, and would benefit greatly if some way could be found for developing understanding of other areas and dimensions. This was not only a question of integration across the boundaries of research projects, but also of giving thought to aspects of the total problem not being tackled in any of the existing research efforts.

Early in 1950 the Social Science Research Council, in response to expressions of these needs, brought together two conferences of social scientists and psychiatrists to consider the common ground in their fields of interest. Those attending these meetings were: Nathan W. Ackerman, Henry W. Brosin, Donald T. Campbell, John A. Clausen, Robert A. Cohen, Kingsley Davis, John Dollard, Joseph W. Eaton, Clements C. Fry, Herbert Goldhamer, Ernest M. Gruenberg, Allan R. Holmberg, Marie Jahoda, Alexander H. Leighton, Erich Lindemann, Quinn McNemar, A. R. Mangus, Ørnulf Ødegaard, Thomas A. C. Rennie, John Romano, Leo W. Simmons, Raymond Sletto, and M. Brewster Smith.

## PROPOSAL FOR A COUNCIL COMMITTEE

From these two conferences and a panel discussion held at the spring meeting of the Council that same year, there was formulated a proposal for a committee on research in psychiatry and the social sciences. The basis for this proposal was as follows:

1. *Evident prevalence of mental illness.* War experience, hospital admission rates, and the demand for pri-

\* The author is Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences, Cornell University, and Professor of Psychiatry (Social Psychiatry), Cornell University Medical College. He was a member of the board of directors of the Council, 1949-54.

<sup>1</sup> For descriptions of several of the projects, see *Interrelations between the Social Environment and Psychiatric Disorders: Papers Presented at a Round Table at the 1952 Annual Conference of the Milbank Memorial Fund* (New York: Milbank Memorial Fund, 1953).

vate psychiatric service, all combine to create a sense of enormous need but at the same time a sense of blind groping when it comes to specifying the extent of mental illness, its distribution and characteristics in the population, and the kind of steps appropriate for dealing with it in terms both of treatment and of cause. These are problems beyond the capabilities of psychiatry, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and statistics, each taken by itself, but they might be susceptible to a joint attack if conceptual tools could be developed whereby these disciplines would work together.

2. *Need for a concept of mental health.* One can identify for all practical purposes a number of different types of mental illness. With regard to mental health, however, there appears to be little, except personal values and preferences, that goes beyond postulating the absence of symptoms and symptom patterns. It seems evident that a practical definition of mental health would give something to work toward, in contrast to flight from symptoms.

3. *Relation of mental illness to social pathology.* Assuming that we can agree that some types of group behavior are pathological because destructive to the group—gangsterism, poverty, anomie, for instance—is there a significant relationship between such prairie fires in society and the phenomena with which the psychiatrist deals in the individual?

4. *Sociocultural change.* One of the characteristics of the world at present is the prevalence of change, change in virtually all dimensions and apparently accelerating. What does this mean for mental health? Does it advance like a tornado wrenching from the individual all his guide posts, fences, defenses, and even his role-clothing until he is left stuporous, or twitching with psychopathological mechanisms? Or is change the collective manifestation of individual madness? Or both, in a vicious circle? Or is there a balanced and healthy way to live with zest for the opportunities afforded by the new for human growth, and can this be expanded?

5. *Personality development.* In addition to the question of avenues toward the reduction of mental illness, there is also the possibility of drawing from mental illness greater knowledge regarding normal behavior, regarding the basic processes of personality. Pathology has often been the window through which the characteristics of normal functions have been discovered. This is illustrated and dramatized in the case of Alexis St. Martin who in an accident with a gun opened up not only his stomach, but medical knowledge regarding digestion.

Many psychiatrists, particularly Freud and Meyer, have pointed out that the same applies with regard to psychological disorder.

The desired committee on research in psychiatry and the social sciences was appointed by the Council in the spring of 1950. The original members, together with some later additions, include: Henry W. Brosin, John A. Clausen, Joseph W. Eaton, Herbert Goldhamer, Ernest M. Gruenberg, Clyde Kluckhohn, Erich Lindemann, F. C. Redlich, the late Thomas A. C. Rennie, James S. Tyhurst, Edmund H. Volkart, and myself as chairman. Valuable assistance has been provided by Council staff, particularly by M. Brewster Smith and Robert N. Wilson, who attended nearly all meetings while they were members of the staff.

### THE COMMITTEE'S APPROACH

The committee has directed its attention to the following matters: (1) a comparative and analytic review of concepts and methods relevant to understanding the nature of mental health and disease (viewed as processes that have both individual and group aspects); (2) the definition of significant problem areas that invite research attention.

In approaching these questions the effort has been to examine social and individual theories of human behavior with emphasis on understanding the *person* in a *social matrix*, both of which have a history and both of which are undergoing constant change. It was hoped that out of such study there might come opportunities to enlarge our conceptual horizons and at the same time establish guides for action in dealing with mental illness and in the promotion of mental health.

After some time devoted to discussing concepts, the committee agreed that initial emphasis should be placed on phenomena that had both individual and group aspects. At first these were defined in terms of the foci of ongoing research projects in social psychiatry. Following some experimentation, however, this procedure did not prove workable and it was decided to have a wider framework of ideas from which to make selection. Topics were then chosen to serve as "portals of entry" into analytic discussion of the interplay of personality processes and social processes. Examples of portals of entry suggested by various committee members are: suicide, bereavement, social disorganization, social mobility, rates of first admission to mental hospitals, and various clinical syndromes. It was agreed that with such points for beginning, concepts from a number of relevant disciplines might be introduced and discussed. The approach, in short, was problem oriented, and it was hoped that the whole—portals of entry, analysis, and

conclusion—would take the form of a monograph. Financial support for continuation of the project was obtained by the Council from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund; and Clausen, Wilson, and myself later were designated as an editorial subcommittee.

### THE PRODUCT OF THE COMMITTEE

The resultant manuscript bears the title *Explorations in Social Psychiatry* and is to be published by Basic Books, Inc. in December 1957. The core of the volume consists of eleven chapters by a number of different authors. An introduction, two additional chapters, and considerable integrative discussion laminated between the reports have been supplied by the editors.

The introduction and the first chapter by the editors forecast the content and try to introduce certain themes and viewpoints for the illumination of the volume as a whole.

In the first of three main parts, four chapters—all by physicians—share an essentially clinical orientation. The point of departure consists in medically recognizable types of disorder, and the social environment is assessed with regard to its potential influence.

"Paranoid Patterns" by James S. Tyhurst deals with a psychiatric condition that is relatively clear-cut. Despite the existence of difficulties in defining the margins of this and most other clinical syndromes, the condition is obviously a type of malfunction and its presenting features can be recognized by the nonclinician as well as by the clinician. The discussion sets up a number of critical questions which apply to most other psychiatric disorders and which also emerge when one approaches the field from another direction and attempts to assess sociocultural patterns, such as reactions to bereavement, that have bearing on mental health.

"Social Forces and the Neurotic Process" by Lawrence S. Kubie, following as it does on a chapter that is largely concerned with a type of psychosis, provides opportunity for perceiving some of the similarities and differences in these two major areas in the field of psychiatry—psychosis and neurosis. A feature of particular interest is the closer approach of the neuroses to everyday human experience and the relevance of this to basic characteristics in the processes of personality.

The next chapter by Lawrence E. Hinkle and Harold G. Wolff is called "Experimental Investigations of the Manner in Which Man's Relation to His Social Environment Affects His Health." Here perspectives are opened up regarding the nature of mental illness in relation to other illnesses and to the basic process of living itself. In this range are the disturbances often called "psychosomatic" or "psychophysiological."



"The Concept of Health in Psychiatry" by F. C. Redlich is directed at one of the most critical questions in the whole of social psychiatry. Possibly it is *the* portal through which we have to pass before much progress can be made in other directions. It involves defining the basic units which are to be the focus of our observations, experiments, and analysis. Redlich's discussion of the concepts of health and illness is in part a summary of the individual, clinical orientation that characterizes the three preceding chapters. It also serves as a prelude to the more explicitly sociocultural emphasis of the later chapters.

In Part II, three chapters begin this emphasis, and behavior of a pathological type is examined as it occurs in two or more associated persons.

"Neurotic Patterns in the Family" by E. J. Cleveland and W. D. Longaker takes the family as a logical starting point for considering psychiatric disorder in terms of a socially patterned phenomenon. The authors suggest that neuroses are often responses to a disarranged family setting with particular reference to contradictory value premises existing in the culture in which the family participates. They emphasize a neurotic pattern they call "disparagement" and point it up as a mode of behavior transmitted between generations, the manifestations of which correspond closely to the phenomenon designated by sociologists as *anomie*.

John A. Clausen's "Social Patterns and Personality as Related to Drug Use among Adolescents" is the first chapter by a social scientist rather than a psychiatrist. The concentration of drug use in economically deprived areas and in adolescent gangs demonstrates the channeling of personal deviance by social factors. Drug use is also of interest because it exemplifies a gradation between normal and pathological patterns. The author's development of the topic makes it clear that not all drug use, even excessive drug use, necessarily has a base in psychopathology, that is, in malfunctioning psychological processes as these are commonly conceived. In other words, sociocultural patterns may produce drug use via normally functioning psychological systems. This may be distinguished from the point of reference in all the preceding chapters in which sociocultural factors are pictured as producing symptoms through damage to the psychological processes of the individual, or through precipitating symptoms in already damaged persons. It leads one to ponder whether other commonly recognized symptom complexes, such as those labeled anxiety, may not at times have such genesis. This in turn brings us back to the problem of specifying the identity of the phenomenon we are attempting to explain—our unit of analysis in mental health and mental illness.

"Socially Shared Psychopathology" by Ernest M.

Gruenberg presents a dramatic blending of intrapsychic disorders and deranged interpersonal relations. In reviewing the literature, the author points up some instances of disturbed behavior that are very widely shared, as in the dancing manias. For the most part, however, the emphasis here is on family groups and the sharing of delusions. He gives a critical review of conceptions regarding factors involved and raises questions that have bearing on all the preceding chapters. Several examples are given of how the advance of knowledge has been hampered by the failure to make accurate and extensive observations and by the scrambling of observable phenomena and theoretical inference and hence assuming the unassumable.

Part III is composed of four chapters concerned with a number of facets of the over-all cultural setting of mental illness.

"Bereavement and Mental Health" by Edmund H. Volkart describes the cultural patterns and individual reactions accompanying the rupture of a close interpersonal bond. Any one of the major events in the life cycle (marriage, birth of children, etc.) might equally well have served as a focus for analyzing the mutual significance of cultural patterns and personality in relation to mental health. Using the topic selected, the author points out that certain societies seem to prepare their members for bereavement and prescribe dimensions of mourning, grief, and subsequent activity in a fashion less potentially devastating to the bereaved individual than are the corresponding patterns in other societies. Thus we confront a common and difficult human experience which may be normal or pathological in its implications for the individual, depending in part at least on a complex of sociocultural factors.

"Three Social Variables and the Occurrence of Mental Disorder" by Eleanor Leacock is concerned with urban versus rural residence, ethnic origin, and social class and illustrates an epidemiological approach to mental illness. Gross identifying characteristics of large groups are compared with the distribution of known disordered individuals. The author's analysis indicates the complexity of such comparisons and the absence of neat relationships between the most obvious social characteristics and the varieties of individual pathology as these are found in institutions.

"The Psychiatric Clinic as a Community Innovation" by Alice Longaker and myself introduces the question of society's response to the existence of mental illness. We attempt to make some generalizations regarding what happens when an institution designed to provide service and to foster prevention is introduced to a group that previously had no such pattern in its social system. The study is descriptive and inferential, with conclu-

sions which we hope have implications both for practical work and the design of more definitive research.

"The Impact of Mental Disease on Society" by Ernest M. Gruenberg and Seymour Bellin opens still more widely the question of the sociocultural response to the existence of mental illness. It brings us again to a point made earlier by Redlich, namely, that the pattern, mental illness, involves more than the patient. The patient's intrapsychic processes and behavior are of course a part of the picture, but so also are the sentiments, perceptions, and patterns of response exhibited by other persons who fill particular roles in the society. The authors organize their material in terms of a general review of the impact of mental illness on society, including the numerical and economic magnitude of the problem, with emphasis on changing concepts. The implications of current trends are pointed out in a series of penetrating questions aimed at salient research needs for both responsible action and progressive development of more adequate concepts.

The final chapter attempts in some degree to draw the book together, but its main point is the discussion of issues which the editors think are implicit or explicit throughout the volume and significant for the development of social psychiatry. These are matters of clarifying concepts so that questions susceptible to research can be asked.

It was the committee's belief, at the beginning, that its aims and its sense of what could be done were modest. Yet, even this modicum has turned out to be over-ambitious, for it has taken us about six years to accomplish half of what we thought we might. We have been through a number of storms, in which the planks of our interdisciplinary ship have threatened to go back to their various, native forests. Nevertheless, there has been survival, a manuscript has been produced, and the participants in the undertaking feel they have learned and benefited enormously from the opportunity provided for this joint endeavor.

## REPORT ON THE CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY: PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING

by Bryce Wood

THE developing importance of national security policy has attracted the attention of an increasing number of social scientists interested in the possible contributions of independent research and analysis to this broad and indefinite area. During the past five years the Council's Committee on National Security Policy Research<sup>1</sup> and its predecessor, the Committee on Civil-Military Relations Research, have endeavored, primarily through the publication of a bibliography and a report on a survey of research<sup>2</sup> and through the administration of two programs of grants for research—on the history of American military policy, and on problems of national defense since 1939—to encourage and assist historians and other social scientists to carry on research in a field with which these disciplines have been little concerned until recently. In the autumn of 1956 several factors, including

the offering of new courses in universities, the publication of several major reports of research, and the imminent publication of other relevant works, combined to convince the committee that the time was ripe for an interchange of views among research scholars, teachers, and government officials, both civilian and military. The committee consequently planned the conference on problems of research and teaching in the field of national security policy, which was held at Dartmouth College on June 24–26, 1957.

The 50 persons invited to participate in the conference represented a broad range of experience.<sup>3</sup> A substantial number were beginning their careers in research

<sup>1</sup> The present members of the committee are William T. R. Fox, Columbia University (chairman); Herbert Goldhamer, RAND Corporation; Henry A. Kissinger, Harvard University; Richard W. Leopold, Northwestern University; G. A. Lincoln, U. S. Military Academy; John W. Masland, Dartmouth College; Arthur Smithies, Harvard University; Harold Stein, Twentieth Century Fund; staff, Bryce Wood.

<sup>2</sup> *Civil-Military Relations: An Annotated Bibliography, 1940–1952* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954); and William T. R. Fox, "Civil-Military Relations Research," *World Politics*, January 1954, pp. 278–288.

<sup>3</sup> The 48 attendants were: Raymond J. Albright, Holbert N. Carroll, Richard D. Challener, Stetson Conn, Col. Paul C. Davis, Col. T. N. Dupuy, William R. Emerson, William T. R. Fox, J. Wayne Fredericks, George A. Graham, Fred Greene, Kent R. Greenfield, Capt. Abbott C. Greenleaf, Paul Y. Hammond, H. Field Haviland, Jr., Pendleton Her-ring, Roger Hilsman, Samuel P. Huntington, Morris Janowitz, Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Henry A. Kissinger, Richard W. Leopold, Col. G. A. Lincoln, Harvey Mansfield, William W. Marvel, John W. Masland, Capt. Robert J. C. Maulsby, Ernest R. May, Col. John C. Meyer, Walter Millis, Louis Morton, Robert E. Osgood, James A. Perkins, Harry H. Ransom, Warner R. Schilling, J. C. Shelburne, Col. Wilfred J. Smith, Capt. William Y. Smith, Arthur Smithies, Glenn H. Snyder, Timothy Stanley, Harold Stein, Comdr. Mitchell P. Strohl, Kenneth W. Thompson, Gordon B. Turner, Seymour Weiss, William Wiseley, Bryce Wood.

and teaching in universities and liberal arts colleges. Government service during World War II had attracted others to this field of inquiry, and they had continued to work in it. Several of the military officers were teaching in the War Colleges of the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy; others held staff positions, and one was concerned with instruction in the Reserve Officers Training Corps. Among the government officials present were staff members of the Office of the Chief of Military History, and of agencies having operating responsibilities for national defense programs.

The committee viewed the conference not as providing a forum for the debate of substantive questions of national security policy, but as a means for exploring possibilities and ways in which social science research could throw light on issues of national security, and ways in which current offerings in the universities could stimulate future scholars to undertake studies in this field, and direct the attention of men of affairs to the value of such studies.

#### SCOPE AND NATURE OF THE FIELD

There may be differences of opinion as to the justification for regarding national security policy as a distinct "field" for research and teaching, although this particular aspect was not debated at the conference. On the basis of the discussions, the subject matter of national security policy includes topics in three main categories: (1) the nature of strategy in the nuclear age—concepts of limited warfare; the character and possibilities of deterrents; the circumstances, if any, under which nuclear weapons might be used in warfare; the potentialities of disarmament; strategic implications of complex weapons systems, etc.; (2) relationships between military strategy and diplomacy in the pursuit of national objectives, that is, between the use of force and of such other instruments of policy as propaganda, strategic intelligence, economic pressures, alliances, and the resources of the United Nations; (3) domestic problems involved in sustaining a high degree of military preparedness over an indefinite period in a precarious international situation, including problems of civil defense, political and financial limitations on expenditures, industrial and manpower mobilization, organization for policy planning and for coordination of military and other factors of foreign policy.

All these topics are of course of intense concern to governmental officials and legislators. Scholars as citizens are hardly less concerned; and some of them are interested further in finding out whether and to what extent their professional competence can be applied to the problems faced by those who make policy decisions.

In some ways, national security policy as a subject for scholarly attention does not differ greatly from such areas as public finance or public administration. In one significant respect, however, national security policy is different, and that is in the novelty of its problems, for which there seems to be no counterpart in American experience. One participant had found in his own work that the existing military histories were of little use in trying to understand the problems of the years since 1949; the acquisition by the Soviet Union of nuclear weapons and the polarization of the world combined with the attempt to deal with that polarization, as in Korea, by military force in the shadow of the atomic bomb had created a discontinuity in history. The conventional strategic answers no longer sufficed, in this view, and it was imperative to attempt to evolve a new theory of war and of international relations; in the meantime it was necessary to reconsider strategy and foreign policy each day. This theme was echoed by other speakers who noted that lack of experience in the new situation had greatly reduced the disabilities that formerly inhibited expression, or led to disregard of the views of commentators on strategy who lacked military training. It was observed that even if it were not quite true that every man was now his own strategist, both military and civilian framers of national security policy were more willing than ever before to listen to the ideas of serious amateur students of policy.

#### ACADEMIC COURSES AND OTHER INSTRUCTION IN THE FIELD

In this novel situation in which the "lessons of history" and the "principles of strategy" were thought to have lost much of the value they held through World War II, what might be the roles of the independent scholar and the university teacher also interested in research? In a session devoted to the teaching of courses relating to national security policy, the conference heard brief descriptions of a dozen graduate and undergraduate courses offered by university departments of history, political science, and sociology; of instruction offered by the Defense Studies Program at Harvard University; of plans for a syllabus for a course in military history being developed by the Office of the Chief of Military History; and of some aspects of training under R.O.T.C. programs. A number of participants engaged in teaching had made available copies of their course outlines and bibliographies, and these were distributed to the conference. The teaching picture was a varied one; attempts to introduce materials on national security policy into courses on American government and foreign policy had met with different degrees of success. Courses offered at



the University of Chicago, and at Harvard, Princeton, and Yale Universities were variously entitled "Government and Defense," "American Strategic Doctrine, Organization, and Policy," "Civil-Military Relations in Western Society," "Politics and War in Western Society," and "Military Power in Foreign Policy." As the discussion and the amplitude of course bibliographies attested, obtaining reading materials is a much smaller obstacle to effective teaching than it was as recently as five years ago. However, the situation was not regarded with complacency; the new books that have appeared were not considered substitutes for texts for students, and bibliographic aids were still inadequate. It was pointed out that comparative studies of military policy in different countries, and case studies of the elements of choice in critical decisions on military policy in the United States would be useful supplements to textbooks.

It was observed that some historians and political scientists are hesitant because of their lack of knowledge of military strategy and weaponry to undertake to teach courses in this general field. Whereas available materials permit a substantial measure of self-education concerning military strategy, there is a real gap in the literature on modern weapons of war. A nontechnical treatise on the capabilities and characteristics of weapons and weapons systems possessed by the three branches of the military establishment should prove useful to social scientists interested in research or teaching in this area.

### LIMITATIONS ON RESEARCH

Most of the conference discussions dealt with the limits and character of scholarly research and analysis concerned with national security policy. The serious limitations of documentary research on national security policy arising from the unavailability of materials were explicitly recognized. Permission to read certain source materials is occasionally obtained by qualified scholars, sometimes only after personal security clearance, but such access is not necessarily accompanied by the clearance of notes or of manuscripts based on such documentary sources. The participants generally shared the hope that the continuing efforts of the Office of the Chief of Military History would bring improvement in the situation, both in respect to the declassification of materials and readier access by scholars.

The significance of these limitations, however, was not thought to warrant overemphasis. Valuable sources of information are available to scholars in congressional committee hearings, other public documents, memoirs, and the daily press. From these sources the general nature of policy problems could be delineated, and supplementary information might be gleaned from inter-

views with present and former officials. The view was expressed by several participants that questions about the availability of factual data or of documentary sources are both less difficult and less important than questions of theoretical understanding about the use of force in foreign policy in the present era. In this view, research of the types familiar to diplomatic historians is less relevant to the field of national security policy than a combination of research on unclassified materials with attempts to analyze military problems in their full political and psychological contexts. Also, the greatest opportunities for scholars concerned with this field lie in the creation, examination, and refinement of new concepts. For example, limited war may be a novel and even alien concept in American military thought; historians might review fruitfully the experience with this concept in other times and societies, and students of strategy might do well to re-examine the work of Clausewitz and other theorists. Similarly, other social scientists might study the relationships between disarmament and strategy in an age of absolute weapons and of less than absolute weapons, or the influence of factors of economic capacity and policy objectives on the selection of a limited number of weapons systems.

On these and other problems, civilian and military policy-makers are looking for guidance and advice. In this connection there are dangers as well as opportunities for scholars: they could be drawn so close to policy making that their work would be in the nature of writing "position papers," or they could be turned into spokesmen for governmental factions urging the adoption of different lines of policy. It was thought that social scientists in universities should remain sufficiently far from policy making for their contributions to provide perspective for practitioners; social scientists might well analyze the implications of alternative policies rather than make recommendations for or against particular ones.

A note of caution was voiced in this connection. It was hoped that concern with theory would not exclude attention to political realities: policy decisions in a democracy are sometimes reached on the basis of both domestic and external political factors that relegate strategic logic to a secondary position, as, it was suggested, in the case of the decision to resist aggression in Korea.

### PROBLEMS OF COMMUNICATION AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE FUTURE

If social scientists actually observe the distinction between advocacy and analysis, which is a difficult task in this policy field, they still face the problem of effective

communication with officials who deal with policy. This is a two-way problem, which involves the relevance of social science research to the policy maker's concerns and the researchability of the latter. If research is to appear relevant in the eyes of policy makers, its relation to their problems must be shown in a form and in language that will hold their attention. Conversely, those who wish to communicate the results of their research to this audience require access not only to facts but to policy makers' views of the relative importance and the dimensions of their problems.

The conference recognized that social science research techniques might be inapplicable to many policy issues, especially those demanding swift decisions. On the other hand, research might contribute to the making of rational policy decisions if the crucial factors could be stated in terms sufficiently specific and circumscribed to appear researchable to social scientists. Although the whole field of national security policy is of mutual concern to some scholars and government officials, there apparently has not been enough mutual understanding to permit the development of a fully advantageous relationship. If, for example, officials request assistance from scholars in defining the goals of policy, the latter may well be incapable of responding to this request in research terms. At the same time, social scientists may be overmodest in estimating their competence in research relevant to policy, and the view was expressed that there is ample latitude for the scholar willing to assemble and analyze the nonclassified data available.

Two suggestions were made for bridging the gap between relevance of social science research and researchability of the policy maker's problems. The first was that greater opportunities might be developed for bring-

ing together social scientists and officials, to give the former a better idea of the dimensions of policy problems, and to give the latter an appreciation of the capabilities and the limitations of independent research on policy questions. Brief conferences or longer seminars focused on one or two specific policy problems might be mutually helpful. The second suggestion was that in the course of their research social scientists might find it useful to consult with men having experience in policy making. It was thought that certain types of research in this field may be beyond the capacity of single individuals and may require group efforts.

It is not possible here to outline the many other topics discussed at the conference, but brief mention may be made of a few. With regard to civilian and military approaches to national security policy, there was a tendency to minimize the significance of differences between the "civilian mind" and the "military mind" as these categories had been traditionally interpreted. At the same time, it was considered undesirable to overemphasize the similarity of military and civilian approaches to foreign policy problems, since there are some differences in approach. If research could distinguish between those differences that have a useful, professionally important purpose and others that merely give rise to unnecessary friction, this would be a helpful contribution.

Not all the participants shared the position noted above about discontinuity in military history. Some pointed out that the study of military history would have value to the extent that limited warfare remains a tool of statecraft, and that the work of diplomatic historians, for example, would continue to be useful, not only by providing checks on theory but also by presenting data from which generalizations might be developed.

## COUNCIL FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, 1957-58

FOR over three decades the Council has maintained fellowship and grant-in-aid programs designed to further the development of research workers in all fields of social science. Two basic types of award have been offered throughout this span of time: research training fellowships and grants-in-aid of research. The former enable young social scientists to secure, either just before or soon after receiving the doctorate, special advanced training or research experience beyond the normal requirements for the Ph.D. degree; the latter provide limited financial assistance to more mature social scientists who could not otherwise meet the direct costs

of their individual research projects. In 1950 and 1957, respectively, two other related programs were inaugurated: faculty research fellowships, which offer a few exceptionally promising men and women in their thirties the opportunity to devote more than half of their time for three years to their own research; and faculty research grants, which typically provide maintenance in lieu of salary for a half year or less, as well as funds for research expenses.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A limited program of this general type was offered in 1951 and 1952 for faculty of independent liberal arts colleges, by virtue of a grant to the Council from the Twentieth Century Fund.



Under all the programs just mentioned, effort is made to select the most able individuals, without regard to any quotas for particular disciplines or substantive fields of interest. The Committee on Social Science Personnel, which administers the research training fellowship program, frequently seeks to guide its appointees to the most effective ways of achieving their goals; but it does not attempt to persuade them to change their goals, nor does it give preference to applicants whose projects happen to lie within fields that are of current interest to other committees of the Council. In short, the guiding premise is that the advancement of social science will be best served in the long run by aiding those individuals who in the judgment of the committee appear to have the highest talent for research.

From time to time during the Council's history, other fellowships and grants have been offered for equally broad purposes. For several years in the 1930's graduate study fellowships were offered to college seniors on the basis of competitive examinations, with the aim of attracting superior talent into careers in social science. More recently, from 1953 through 1956, undergraduate research stipends were awarded to students who spent the summer between their junior and senior college years in research under the personal guidance of designated faculty supervisors; between a quarter and a half of these students were subsequently given first-year graduate study fellowships by the Council, and many others also undertook graduate study in the social sciences.

A number of organizations other than the Council in recent years have inaugurated or expanded programs of fellowships under which students of the social sciences can obtain support for study or research in particular fields. Among these may be mentioned the Fulbright awards and the overseas fellowships of the Ford Foundation, which are available only in designated countries or areas. And there are other large programs of recent origin that are restricted to particular disciplines or professional fields, such as mental health, and demography. These specialized fellowship programs are symptomatic of a current tendency to concentrate on activities immediately related to contemporary national or world problems. Conversely, it appears increasingly difficult for the Council to obtain funds for fellowships and grants to individuals whose interests are of less obvious practical utility. Thus the social sciences face a situation quite analogous to that which has been repeatedly deplored by thoughtful natural scientists: we run the risk of starving the goslings who may grow up to lay golden eggs.

Although it is hard to find an attentive audience in the midst of urgent demands for solutions of today's political and social problems, this point must be reiterated:

It takes nearly half a generation to educate a creative scholar or scientist; no one can accurately predict the problems with which he will have to grapple decades from now, and no one can foresee the priceless insight he may achieve and the practical consequences it may have years hence if he now has the opportunity to develop his talents. It is argued, to be sure, that basic discoveries are sometimes by-products of efforts to invent better mousetraps; but a little study of the history of science reveals that this is by no means always the case, and that but for the idle curiosity of impractical scholars in the past our world would differ far less than it does from that of Neanderthal Man.

Our technology rests on the work of many kinds of innovators, and in the realm of the social sciences many kinds are similarly indispensable. But while the contributions of those who wrestle with practical problems are recognized and welcomed, social science theorists must publish the results of their work in specialized journals read by a few scholars. In the present world crisis, such organizations as the Council accept an especial obligation to find, encourage, and aid potential contributors to social science. The word *potential* is emphasized for it is obviously impossible to know in advance that a certain scholar will eventually make a major contribution to basic theory or methodology; it is possible to predict with much more confidence that a well-trained technician will find a solution to a given concrete problem. In stressing the potentially great yield rather than an assured but small yield, we accept the likelihood—indeed the virtual certainty—that a significant proportion of fellowships and grants will add nothing of demonstrable value. This wastage is the price that must be paid for keeping alive the sporadic fires of genius. A governmental agency or a commercial firm may justifiably decline to take such risks, but educational and scientific organizations such as universities and the Council are bound by their nature to assume them.

The social sciences face a dilemma: The public must have faith in applied social science as a means of solving problems before it will be willing to invest its money freely in the further development of basic social science without which there will be little to "apply." The danger is that current demands upon social scientists to translate their skills into what is sometimes called human engineering may quickly exhaust the existing store of basic knowledge. Under these circumstances it is incumbent on social scientists both to respond as effectively as possible to current public needs and to devote increasing resources to the development of basic social science.

The imminent enormous demand for college teachers in the next several years cannot be ignored in assessing the prospects of research in the social sciences. With com-

petitive bidding on the part of teaching institutions and consumers of applied social science, it is easy to envisage a situation where, in the language of manpower experts, every capable social scientist in the country will be "utilized to his fullest capacity." The Council is concerned with the development and survival of social scientists who will not be "utilized" by anybody but will continue the pursuit of basic knowledge.

It is in this context that the Council's unspecialized fellowship and grant programs assume increased importance despite—and even because of—the multiplication of alternative sources of income for social scientists and students of social science. The unspecialized programs now account for about half of the Council's current expenditures for fellowships and grants. As specified below, the Council will offer more than a dozen kinds of fellowships and grants in the coming year.

It is the Council's aim to contribute, to the extent that its resources permit, to the development of the most promising individuals who can be found anywhere in the field of social science. Under prevailing conditions it must try to achieve this partly by the coordination of a number of separate fellowship and grant programs, some of which are restricted as to discipline or field of interest and administered by special committees. In order to use all the available funds to maximum advantage, it was decided some years ago that an applicant whose interests and needs are within the scope of one of the specialized programs should not normally be eligible to compete under one of the unspecialized programs.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Because the number of awards possible under the Council's programs is relatively small, applicants whose projects lie within the scope of specialized fellowship or grant programs of other organizations are advised to apply also to the latter if possible. The following are some of the specialized programs of interest to social scientists:

Henry L. and Grace Doherty Foundation (Woodrow Wilson Hall, Princeton University) Fellowships for research in Latin America.

Ford Foundation (477 Madison Avenue, New York 22) fellowships for study and research relating to the Near East, Asia, Africa, the U.S.S.R., and East European areas; also fellowships in economics and international relations.

Fulbright awards for graduate study and postdoctoral research in certain foreign countries.

National Institute of Mental Health (Bethesda 14, Maryland) fellowships and research grants in psychology and related fields.

National Science Foundation (Washington 25, D. C.) fellowships and grants in anthropology, geography, psychology (except clinical); in history, philosophy, and sociology of science; and in certain fields of convergence between the natural and social sciences.

## FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

TO BE OFFERED IN 1957-58

The Council will offer in 1957-58 most of the types of fellowships and grants that were described in its Announcement for 1956-57, and several new types. A booklet describing the offerings for the coming year will be distributed as usual about October 1, 1957, and will be mailed to individuals on request addressed to the Council at 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. The following programs are to be continued on substantially the same basis as last year, with applications due on January 6, 1958:

Research Training Fellowships  
Fellowships in Political Theory and Legal Philosophy  
Faculty Research Fellowships  
Grants-in-Aid of Research and Faculty Research Grants  
Grants for Research on State Politics  
Grants for Research on National Defense Problems since 1939  
Grants for Slavic and East European Studies.

Also to be continued but with applications due on December 1, 1957 are:

Grants for Field Studies of Political Groups in Foreign Areas  
Grants for Research on American Governmental Processes.

Two new programs of research grants to be inaugurated this year were described in the June 1957 issue of *Items*, page 24, and a new program of travel grants is described in this issue, page 40 *infra*. These programs and closing dates for applications are as follows:

Grants for Research on the Near and Middle East; November 1, 1957  
Senior Research Awards in Governmental Affairs; November 1, 1957  
International Conference Travel Grants; applications for the Pacific Science Congress due September 30, 1957; and for 1958 conferences, February 1, 1958.

Population Council (230 Park Avenue, New York 17) fellowships and grants for training and research in demography.

Attention is also called to grants offered by the American Philosophical Society (104 South Fifth Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa.) for research in all fields of scholarship, including the social sciences. Awards are made at several times during the year and hence may be available to applicants who are unable to conform to the time schedules of the Council's programs.

## COMMITTEE BRIEFS

### ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC CENSUS DATA

John Perry Miller (chairman), Francis M. Boddy, Robert W. Burgess, Howard C. Grieves, Frank A. Hanna, George J. Stigler, Ralph J. Watkins, J. Fred Weston.

The committee has defined a number of significant subjects on which monographs analyzing data from the recent censuses of manufactures, distribution, and mineral industries may be prepared, if competent analysts and sufficient funds can be obtained. Two projects under its auspices have been initiated, and exploratory work is under way on a third. Carl Kaysen, Professor of Economics, Harvard University, in July began an analysis of the company structure of American industry, on the basis of the data on companies first collected in the 1954 census of manufactures. In September Victor R. Fuchs, Assistant Professor of Economics, Columbia University, will undertake a study of the nature and extent of changes in the location of manufacturing establishments from 1929 to 1954, in an attempt to explain differential rates of growth in geographic areas.

### COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Gabriel A. Almond (chairman), Taylor Cole, James S. Coleman, Roy C. Macridis, Sigmund Neumann, Guy J. Pauker, Lucian W. Pye, Walter R. Sharp; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

In addition to the 17 grants to individuals for field studies of political groups in foreign areas, reported in *Items*, March 1957, page 8, an award was made to Ralph E. Purcell, Professor of Government, Sweet Briar College, for research in India on the political role of the Indian bureaucracy. The second and final competition for grants under this two-year program will be held during the coming year.

One of the objectives of the committee is to try to maximize the contributions that studies aided by it and comparable studies under other auspices may make to the development of theories of interest groups, political parties, and public opinion. In an effort to find ways of assuring cumulative results of studies of political groups in different regions of the world, and to determine the extent to which research in widely different political cultures can produce comparable findings, the committee has started some experiments in collaborative research. Since grants under the committee's current program are made only to individuals for research on political groups in foreign countries, the recipients share some interests, even though their research proposals are uniquely their own. The committee has desired neither to divert their research interests nor to supervise their work, but to promote cumulativeness and comparability of research by discussions with the recipients of grants and others before they begin research in the field. The committee accordingly initiated a second phase of its program by holding two research planning seminars mainly for the benefit of its grantees.

The first of these seminars was held at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, on

April 6-10, 1957. The participants and the countries represented by their research interests were: Gabriel A. Almond, Princeton University (Germany); George I. Blanksten, Northwestern University (Latin America); Henry W. Ehrmann, University of Colorado (France); Leon Epstein, University of Wisconsin (United Kingdom); Joseph LaPalombara, Michigan State University (Italy); Juan J. Linz, University of California (Spain); Val R. Lorwin, University of Chicago (Belgium); Sigmund Neumann, Wesleyan University (Germany); Lucian W. Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Burma and Malaya); Myron Weiner, University of Chicago (India); Bryce Wood (Latin America). Their discussions dealt with interest groups in relation to (1) public opinion, (2) political parties, (3) the legislative process, and (4) the bureaucracy, and with (5) problems of comparing Western and non-Western interest groups. The agreements reached in sessions on each of these five topics were summarized in reports prepared by subcommittees of the seminar.

The second seminar, primarily for grantees planning field research in Latin America, was held on June 28-30 at Michigan State University. The participants included Robert J. Alexander, Rutgers University; George I. Blanksten, Northwestern University; Frank R. Brandenburg, Michigan State University; Federico G. Gil, University of North Carolina; Joseph LaPalombara, Michigan State University; Robert E. Scott, University of Illinois; and Bryce Wood, who acted as chairman. The earlier reports of the committee, including the report of the Stanford planning sessions, served as the basis of discussions at this seminar. One of its main objectives was to encourage the selection of problems and methods that might make the Latin American studies more comparable with those of the European and Asiatic areas.

The committee hopes that scholars engaging in research under its program and possibly others may be interested in participating in the measures of collaborative research worked out at these seminars. These measures include the exchange of information and hypotheses during the course of field work, and the gathering of certain materials for a survey of the interest group system as a whole in a given country. This survey is regarded as an objective secondary to the intensive study by each scholar, and it would be undertaken as a by-product of each such study. It is anticipated that while the situation will vary greatly in different countries, the process of gathering information about one or several interest groups will offer opportunity to secure at least certain kinds of data about additional groups, and that these data may be of value in subsequent field studies as well as in theoretical analysis. The survey data would be brought together as part of a general description and appraisal of the character of the interest group system in a given country. A provisional outline of the kinds of questions for which answers might be sought in the survey was prepared by the chairman of the committee after the seminars as a guide for collecting comparable data.



## ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Richard Hartshorne, Melville J. Herskovits, Edgar M. Hoover, Bert F. Hoselitz, Wilbert E. Moore, Joseph J. Spengler.

The European studies in the committee's program of appraisals of long-term records relating to national income, wealth, and their components, in selected foreign countries, were reviewed at a meeting of the collaborators with Mr. Kuznets in Cambridge, England, on July 5-7, 1957. Present were Phyllis Deane and W. A. Cole, Department of Applied Economics, University of Cambridge; Jan Marczewski, Institut de Science Économique Appliquée, Paris; J. Heinz Müller and his assistant, Mr. Göhring, University of Freiburg; Heinz König and Franz Grumbach, Institut für Wirtschafts und Sozialwissenschaften, University of Münster; H. C. Bos, Netherlands Economic Institute, Rotterdam; Anders Ølgaard, Institute of Economics and History, Copenhagen; Odd Aukrust and Juul Bjerke, Central Bureau of Statistics, Norway; Erik Lindahl, Osten Johansson, and K. G. Jungenfelt, Economic Research Institute, University of Uppsala.

Brief papers were prepared for the meeting, reporting on progress, noting the major problems encountered, and indicating probable dates of completion of the studies and plans for publication. In each case the results will be published in full detail within the country concerned; the dates of completion of drafts range from 1958 to 1959. The meeting was encouraging in the enthusiasm shown by its members, and in the number of young scholars who found it possible to participate in the enterprise.

At the end of the meeting the collaborators agreed to request the Executive Council of the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth to place the topic of economic growth on the program of the 1959 meeting of the Association. If the Executive Council agrees, there will be a series of papers, one or two for each country, intended to summarize the main findings and to explore their analytical implications—with the hope that these papers could be published by the Association in a single volume.

The papers presented at the 1956 interuniversity summer research seminar on theories of economic growth, which was sponsored by the committee, are being edited by Bert F. Hoselitz, chairman of the seminar, for publication as a monograph.

S. K.

## HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Louis Gottschalk (chairman), W. O. Aydelotte, Thomas C. Cochran, Merle Curti, Roy F. Nichols, David M. Potter.

The committee is concerned with the problem of assessing the propositions and general concepts that are used by historians, among others. It concluded soon after its appointment that the problem was better considered in connection with a specific concept than in the abstract, and at meetings in December and May laid plans (1) for examining the general term *American culture*, or *character*, or *civilization*—

deliberately kept vague, to permit examination of the process by which perhaps definition and precision may be reached; and (2) for keeping in touch with other groups engaged in similar efforts.

The committee was able to take advantage of two immediate opportunities to consider techniques for assessing general concepts and the validity of certain generalizations. Mr. Nichols participated in a conference of historians interested in the development of political behavior and institutions in the American colonies and states prior to 1860, which was held at Rutgers University on June 12-14, 1957, under the chairmanship of Richard P. McCormick. Mr. Potter assisted in developing plans for a second conference proposed by C. Easton Rothwell of the Hoover Institution, to bring historians and other social scientists together to discuss the relevance of their data and techniques for each other's concern with a particular topic. The topic chosen was the growth of the large-scale community, and the conference was held at Stanford University on June 20-22. Messrs. Aydelotte, Cochran, and Potter were among the participants.

L. G.

## NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

T. Cuyler Young (chairman), Hamilton A. R. Gibb, J. C. Hurewitz, Majid Khadduri, William D. Schorger, Wilfred C. Smith; *staff*, Dankwart A. Rustow, Bryce Wood.

Continuing its efforts to identify research needs and research problems in the social sciences as they relate to the Near and Middle East, the committee invited some 35 social scientists and others to participate in a conference on "Fields of Research in Middle East Cultures: Anthropology, Politics, History," held at Gould House, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y., on May 30 - June 1, 1957. As part of the preparation for the conference, six disciplinary study groups designated by the committee had produced reports on the present situation and the developmental outlook for research on the Middle East in their respective fields. The reports of the study groups in anthropology, history, and political science and law were made available to participants in advance of the conference, along with seven papers prepared for the conference by specialists in various fields.

The conference program consisted of three main parts. The sessions on the first day considered general perspectives, and discussed the following papers: "The Problem of Cultural Interchange," by Gustave E. Von Grunebaum, University of Chicago; "The Role of History as Myth," by John A. Wilson, University of Chicago; and "Law as a Social Force in Middle Eastern Culture and Society," by J. N. D. Anderson, University of London. The papers prepared for the discussions of disciplinary research, on the second day, were of different types. In "A Frame of Reference for Anthropological Research on the Middle East," Mr. Schorger outlined "a general framework in which anthropological thinking and research on the area might be ordered." In "The Study of Islamic History in North

America," Mr. Gibb described the present status of the field of Islamic history in Canada and the United States and offered proposals for extending its present limited development. In political science, the participants considered both the substance and methods of two examples of recent field research: "Problems of Islamic Political Thought in the Light of Recent Developments in Pakistan," by Leonard Binder, University of California, Los Angeles; and "Study of a Middle East Political Group as Illustrated by the Muslim Brotherhood," by Richard P. Mitchell, University of Michigan. On the final day the conference was divided into four sections for the purpose of examining the study group reports, and it completed its work in a plenary session in which suggestions for possible future activity of the committee were invited.

In planning this conference, the committee had no intention of attempting to develop blueprints for research but rather to develop a greater understanding of diverse approaches and problems, together with an appreciation of some of the ways in which collaborative research might be furthered. It was recognized that the views of scholars in one discipline as to the assistance that might be furnished by research in another would not necessarily coincide with the latter's conception of the most effective line of its own development. At the same time, it was thought that the identification of gaps in knowledge as perceived by those engaged in one area of research might be of interest to students in a related area, and that mutual awareness of common problems might contribute to the advancement of knowledge. It was evident, for example, that political scientists were just beginning to study political processes in certain Middle Eastern countries; they suspected that the political influences of family ties in these countries differed from comparable influences elsewhere and they welcomed such information as anthropologists could provide on this point. Similarly, economists were interested in any light that anthropologists could throw on factors that might affect the receptivity of village dwellers to participation in a money economy: Under what conditions could villagers be persuaded to refrain from hoarding money paid them by the government as wages for work on public roads?

The nature of the questions raised indicated both the limited development of social science knowledge about the Middle East, and opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration. It was not thought that such collaboration could be promoted by drawing up lists of questions that scholars in one discipline would like to ask of others in order to obtain help in solving problems as defined by the first. Exchanges of views among scholars about the nature of social phenomena in the Middle East, however, might stimulate them to work together as individuals in efforts to increase understanding of the area. Anthropologists interested in further village and urban studies could cooperate in field research with political scientists and economists aware of the need for such studies and interested in broadening their knowledge of problems related to their own concerns. Cooperation between political scientists and anthropologists

was considered particularly promising, since the former recognize that what are called legislatures and parties in the Middle East and in the United States are very different in their operations, and regard their analyses of these differences as incomplete without further research that requires the specialized field techniques and linguistic training of the anthropologist. Studies of local government and of the composition, recruitment, and activity of political groups in Middle Eastern countries were suggested as suitable for such collaboration.

In the field of Islamic history, it was thought that political history should be further explored, but that there was greater need for attention to social and economic developments since 1800, especially to legal institutions, demographic characteristics, and the importance of the arts in Islamic culture.

#### POLITICAL THEORY AND LEGAL PHILOSOPHY FELLOWSHIPS

J. Roland Pennock (chairman), Herbert A. Deane, David Easton, Norman Jacobson, Robert G. McCloskey, F. M. Watkins; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

As an outgrowth of discussions by the committee of relationships between social science research and political theory, the committee held a small conference on "Political Theory and the Organization and Processes of Modern Democracy," at Swarthmore College on June 12-14, 1957. J. Roland Pennock served as chairman of the conference. The 16 participants included 12 younger scholars whose research and recent publications had indicated their interest in theoretical studies of American political institutions. The following papers were prepared and distributed in advance of the conference: "Responsibility as Fact and Norm," by Herbert J. Spiro, Harvard University; "Public Opinion in the Framework of Political Theory," by David W. Minar, Columbia University; "Liberal Democracy and Social Control," by Andrew Hacker, Cornell University; "The Distinction between Public and Private," by H. Mark Roelofs, Cornell University; and "The Nature of Civil Rights," by Francis P. Canavan, S.J., St. Peter's College. A discussion of "Construction of Normative Political Theory" was led by David Easton. It is expected that a report on the substance of the discussions at the conference will appear in a future issue of *Items*.

#### SCALING THEORY AND METHODS

Harold Gulliksen (chairman), John E. Karlin, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Henry Margenau, Frederick Mosteller, John Volkmann; *staff*, Warren S. Torgerson.

The assignment given the committee in 1950 was completed in the spring with the recommendation that the monograph prepared for the committee by Warren S. Torgerson be published. Arrangements have been made to have the manuscript, tentatively entitled *Theory and Methods of Scaling*, published by John Wiley & Sons, and it is hoped that it will be issued early in 1958.

## SLAVIC STUDIES

(Joint with American Council of Learned Societies)

C. E. Black (chairman), William B. Edgerton (secretary), Abram Bergson, Merle Fainsod, H. H. Fisher, Chauncy D. Harris, Ernest J. Simmons, S. Harrison Thomson, René Wellek, Sergius Yakobson.

The joint committee has undertaken a review of the status of Slavic studies in the United States with the aim of evaluating the experience of the past decade and its implications for the future. On May 4, 1957 members of the committee met with a number of invited guests to consider the need for such a review and to draft a preliminary program for it. This program was subsequently elaborated by a subcommittee appointed to administer the review: C. E. Black of Princeton University (chairman); Robert F. Byrnes of Indiana University; Charles Jelavich of the University of California, Berkeley; Henry L. Roberts of Columbia University; Marshal Shulman of Harvard University. John M. Thompson, who is completing graduate training in Russian Studies at Columbia University, serves as staff for the review.

A new grant from the Ford Foundation, to be administered by the Social Science Research Council, has provided for continuation and expansion of the joint committee's program of grants to individuals for Slavic and East European studies, for grants to assist research publications, and for support of research conferences.

Of the recipients of grants listed in *Items*, June 1957, page 23, Ante Kadić has declined his award, and grants have been made to Edgar Anderson and Roderick McGrew, who were listed as alternates. In addition to the three grants to assist publication of research manuscripts, reported in *Items*, March 1957, page 7, a grant has been made to J. A. Rothschild, Instructor in Government, Columbia University, for publication by the Columbia University Press of a history of the Communist Party of Bulgaria to 1935. The Subcommittee on Grants has also made an award to the Program on East Central Europe at Columbia University to facilitate the holding of an interdisciplinary conference on East European studies in American universities and other research organizations.

## PERSONNEL

### GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON AMERICAN GOVERNMENTAL PROCESSES

The Committee on Political Behavior—David B. Truman (chairman), Angus Campbell, Robert A. Dahl, Oliver Garceau, Alexander Heard, V. O. Key, Jr., Avery Leiserson, Dayton D. McKean—at a meeting on May 10 awarded 4 additional grants for research on American governmental processes:

Charles E. Lindblom, Associate Professor of Economics, Yale University, for research on bargaining and related processes in government.

Norton E. Long, Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, for research on political leadership in the Boston metropolitan area.

James A. Maxwell, Professor of Economics, Clark University, for research on attitudes and behavior of governmental officials in Massachusetts concerning problems of countercyclical finance.

James R. Woodworth, Assistant Professor of Social Studies, Miami University, Ohio, for a case study in cooperative federalism: food and drug agencies.

These grants with the 10 listed in the March issue of *Items*, page 8, bring the total awarded by the committee in 1957 to 14.

### FIRST-YEAR GRADUATE STUDY FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Undergraduate Research Training—R. F. Arragon (chairman), Dwight W. Chapman, Wilbert J. McKeachie, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., John W. Roberts, and

Everett K. Wilson—has awarded 2 additional first-year graduate study fellowships for 1957-58, to students who received undergraduate research stipends in 1956:

Anita Negrin Parenti, Pembroke College; psychology.

Henry C. Morlock, Jr., University of Pennsylvania; psychology.

### APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

C. Addison Hickman of North Carolina State College will serve as chairman of the Committee on Business Enterprise Research during 1957-58.

Frederick H. Burkhardt, the new President of the American Council of Learned Societies, has succeeded Mortimer Graves as a member of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils.

Gary S. Becker of Columbia University and Orville G. Brim, Jr., of the Russell Sage Foundation have been appointed to the Committee on the Family and Economic Behavior (formerly known as the Committee on Employment Relationships and the Family).

Mortimer Spiegelman, Associate Statistician, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (chairman); Robert C. Angell, Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan; Ralph L. Beals, Professor of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles; Lee J. Cronbach, Professor of Psychology, University of Illinois; Henry W. Ehrmann, Professor of Political Science, University of Colorado; Frederic C. Lane, Professor of History, Johns Hopkins University; and Edward S. Shaw,



Professor of Economics, Stanford University, have been named a Committee on International Conference Travel Grants to administer the new Council program announced on page 40, infra.

Joseph H. Greenberg of Columbia University has been

named a member of the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology.

Harold F. Dorn of the National Institutes of Health has been appointed to the Committee on Preventive Medicine and Social Science Research.

## PUBLICATIONS

### COUNCIL MONOGRAPHS

*Migration and Mental Disease: A Study of First Admissions to Hospitals for Mental Disease, New York, 1939-1941*, by Benjamin Malzberg and Everett S. Lee, with an introduction by Dorothy S. Thomas. Sponsored by the Committee on Migration Differentials. March 1956. 152 pages. \$1.50.

*Labor Mobility in Six Cities*, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer, with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd, for the Committee on Labor Market Research. June 1954. 191 pages. Paper, \$2.25; cloth, \$2.75.

*Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research*, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

*Support for Independent Scholarship and Research*, by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pages. \$1.25.

### COUNCIL BULLETINS

*Research on Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States*, Bulletin 65, by Herbert S. Parnes. October 1954. 216 pages. \$1.75.

*The Social Sciences in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography*, Bulletin 64. July 1954. 191 pages. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

*Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability*, Bulletin 55, revised edition, by Roger G. Barker, in collaboration with Beatrice A. Wright, Lee Meyerson, Mollie R. Gonick. April 1953. 456 pages. \$2.00.

*Area Research: Theory and Practice*, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pages. \$1.50.

*Culture Conflict and Crime*, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted 1950. 116 pages. \$1.00.

*Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research*, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pages. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

### COUNCIL PAMPHLETS

*The Business Enterprise as a Subject for Research*, Pamphlet 11, by Howard R. Bowen. Sponsored by the Committee on Business Enterprise Research. May 1955. 111 pages. \$1.25.

*Bibliographies on Personality and Social Development of the Child*, Pamphlet 10, compiled by Christoph Heinicke and Beatrice B. Whiting. June 1953. 138 pages. \$1.00.

*Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education*, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pages. 50 cents.

The Council's monographs, bulletins, and pamphlets are distributed from the office of the Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

### CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

These volumes are sponsored by the Committee on Census Monographs in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, and are published by John Wiley & Sons, New York:

*American Agriculture: Its Structure and Place in the Economy*, by Ronald L. Mighell. April 1955. 199 pages. Cloth, \$6.50.

*Income of the American People*, by Herman P. Miller. October 1955. 222 pages. Cloth, \$6.50.

*Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950*, by E. P. Hutchinson. August 1956. 405 pages. Cloth, \$7.50.

*Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950*, by Otis Dudley Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. October 1956. 458 pages. Cloth, \$7.50.

*American Families*, by Paul C. Glick. February 1957. 254 pages. Cloth, \$6.00.

*American Housing and Its Use: The Demand for Shelter Space*, by Louis Winnick, with the assistance of Ned Shilling. March 1957. 157 pages. Cloth, \$5.50.

*Residential Finance in 1950*, by Richard U. Ratcliff, Daniel B. Rathbun, and Junia H. Honnold. September 1957. 222 pages. Cloth, \$5.75.

*Farm Housing*, by Glenn H. Beyer and J. Hugh Rose. October 1957. 240 pages. Cloth, \$6.50.

*America's Children*, by Eleanor H. Bernert. November 1957. 215 pages. Cloth, \$5.50.

*The Changing Population of the United States, 1790-1955*, by Conrad Taeuber and Irene B. Taeuber. December 1957. About 364 pages. Cloth, \$7.50.

### CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION MONOGRAPHS

These monographs are sponsored by the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education and are published by the University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis:

*The American Experience of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath*, by Franklin D. Scott. June 1956. 142 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

*Indian Students on an American Campus*, by Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler. December 1956. 133 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

*No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States*, by Ralph L. Beals and Norman D. Humphrey. August 1957. 159 pages. Cloth, \$3.25.

Special price for the three monographs together (until December 1, 1957), \$7.00.

# ANNOUNCEMENT

## INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

### TRAVEL GRANTS

For the purpose of fostering the exchange of information and ideas among social scientists of different nations, the Council will offer travel grants to scholars residing in the United States, for attendance at selected international congresses and conferences to be held during the next three years. The grants are made possible by an appropriation of \$150,000 to the Council by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Lists of eligible congresses and conferences to be held between November 1957 and the end of the year 1960 will be announced in advance, and grants will be offered only for listed meetings. The following meetings in 1957 and 1958 have been approved by the Council's Committee on International Conference Travel Grants:

Pacific Science Congress, Bangkok, November–December 1957

International Congress of Americanists, Costa Rica, 1958  
International Conference of Agricultural Economists, New Delhi, 1958

International Statistical Institute Meeting, Brussels, 1958  
Congress of the International Political Science Association, Rome, 1958.

International meetings to be held in 1959 and 1960 have not yet been reviewed, but the approved list will undoubtedly include major congresses in the fields of anthropology, economics, history, psychology, sociology, and statistics, if these congresses are to be held outside North America. The committee will entertain suggestions for additions to the 1957–58 list or for inclusion in the 1959 and 1960 lists. To be approved for inclusion in the program a meeting or conference must be sponsored by an international body, or by a national association in a foreign country with the participation of social scientists invited from several nations; and the place of meeting must be outside the United States, Canada, or Mexico.

In selecting recipients of travel grants the committee will seek persons who by their presence, participation, or organiz-

ing services, will make major contributions to the success of a conference; and scholars who by their attendance will gain ideas and contacts that will advance their own research. Special consideration will be given to younger social scientists and to those who have had relatively little opportunity to become acquainted with foreign colleagues. Applicants for grants should have the Ph.D. degree or equivalent qualifications, but need not be members of particular associations.

Because each of the seven associations affiliated with the Council—American Anthropological Association, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, American Psychological Association, American Sociological Society, and American Statistical Association—has received funds for travel expenses of its own official delegates, the Council will not entertain applications for grants to persons proposing to attend conferences in the capacity of officer or other delegate of any of these organizations.

The normal amount of each grant will be equivalent to the lowest round-trip tourist class or excursion airplane fare between the recipient's home and the place of meeting, applicable to the actual period of the conference. Grantees will be free to travel at any time and by any means, but any excess cost must be met from other sources. No allowance will be made for living expenses. Applicants will be expected to accept partial payment of their transportation costs by their own institutions or other sources if such assistance can be obtained. For example, some universities are able to pay travel expenses as far as the United States boundary to their staff members who are going to meetings abroad; in such cases the net grant from the Council will be correspondingly reduced.

Application forms, which will be supplied by the Council on request, must be filed not later than September 30, 1957, for the Pacific Science Congress, and not later than February 1, 1958, for all other 1958 conferences listed above. Grants for the former will be announced as soon as possible after the closing date; for the latter, on or before March 1, 1958.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

*Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences*

*Directors, 1957:* GABRIEL A. ALMOND, TAYLOR COLE, HAROLD F. DORN, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, R. A. GORDON, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, LYLE H. LANIER, EARL LATHAM, DONALD G. MARQUIS, JOHN PERRY MILLER, PHILIP E. MOSELY, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, FRANK C. NEWMAN, WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS, DAVID M. POTTER, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, RICHARD H. SHRYOCK, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, CONRAD TAEUBER, ROBERT L. THORNDIKE, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, RALPH J. WATKINS, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG

*Officers and Staff:* PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIRLEY, *Executive Associate*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*

